



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/803,870	03/12/2001	Philippe Morin	9432-000134	9173		
27572 7590 09/16/2005			EXAM	EXAMINER		
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.			VO, HUYEN X			
P.O. BOX 828						
BLOOMFIELI	O HILLS, MI 48303	🦸 🔻	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2655			
		\(\frac{1}{2}\)	DATE MAILED: 09/16/2009	DATE MAILED: 09/16/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applicati	Application No.		Applicant(s)		
		09/803,8	70	MORIN, PHILIPPE			
		Examine	r	Art Unit			
		Huyen X.	Vo	2655			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR HEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAI is is one of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this community period for reply is specified above, the maximum statute to reply within the set or extended period for reply will eply received by the Office later than three months after the order of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	LING DATE OF TI 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ex cation. ory period will apply and v l, by statute, cause the app	HIS COMMUNICATION rent, however, may a reply be tin rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from blication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 June 2005</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 							
Disposition of Claims							
5)	Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction on Papers The specification is objected to by the E The drawing(s) filed on 12 March 2001 Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to by	examiner. is/are: a) accept to the drawing(s) e correction is requi	requirement. oted or b) objected to be held in abeyance. Second of the drawing(s) is objected if the drawing(s) is objected.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).		
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
2) Notic 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT No(s)/Mail Date		4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate)-152)		

Art Unit: 2655

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant has submitted an amendment filed 6/28/2005, amending the base claims 1-2, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on amended limitation regarding "the set of spoken commands are not obtained from words chosen by a user of the system" and "De Armas does not store words chosen by a user of the system in the set of spoken commands" (see Remarks section page 8). Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection necessitated by claim amendment in view of Davis (US 6816837).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Armas et al. (US 5873064) in view of Davis (US 6816837).
- 4. Regarding claim 1, De Armas et al. disclose a method of navigating a menu structure with an electronic product, comprising the steps of: identifying a first location (sub-context object or window object) within the menu (set of window objects or sub-

Art Unit: 2655

context tree) (col.2, 1n.50 - col.3, In.14 and col.4, In.35-4 3); obtaining a first utterance of speech (col.6, In.19-67); storing said first utterance of speech as a model in a userbuilt lexicon (referring to element 42 in figure 2 and/or col. 6, lines 43-67, it is inherent that the set of appropriate spoken commands are stored within the system); associating the first utterance with the first location and generating therefrom a stored first location (sub-context object vocabulary set) (col.6, In.50-67); obtaining a second utterance of speech (col.6, 1n.19-67); matching the second utterance with model of said first utterance to identify the stored first location (sub-context object vocabulary set or vocabulary sub-sets) within the menu (set of window objects or sub-context tree) (col.5, 1n.44-59); and navigating to the first location (col.5, In.44-59).

De Armas et al. fail to specifically disclose the set of spoken commands are obtained from words chosen by a user of the system. However, Davis teaches a step enabling a user to select voice a macro command to represent one or more predefined voice commands so that next time when the user wants to perform one or more tasks associated with the predefined voice commands, all the user has to do is to speak the voice macro command (*col. 2, lines 1-40*).

Since De Armas et al. and Davis are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify De Armas et al. by incorporating the teaching of Davis in order to eliminate the need to repeat the same set of voice commands for a particular recurring task (*col.* 1, lines 34-38).

Page 4

Art Unit: 2655

5. Regarding claim 2, De Armas et al. discloses a method of navigating a menu structure with an electronic product, comprising the steps of: identifying a user-selected navigation path through the menu structure to a first location within the menu (col. 2, In. 50-col. 3, In. 14 and col. 4, In. 35-43); obtaining a first utterance of speech (col.6, In.19-67); storing said first utterance of speech as a model in a user-built lexicon (referring to element 42 in figure 2 and/or col. 6, lines 43-67, it is inherent that the set of appropriate spoken commands are stored within the system); associating the first utterance with the navigation path (col.5, 1n.44-59 and col.7, In.36-67); obtaining a second utterance of speech (col.6, In.19-67); matching the second utterance with model of said first utterance to retrieve the navigation path (sub-context object path) associated with the first utterance (col. 5, In. 44-59 and col. 7, 1n.36-67); and using the retrieved navigation path to navigate to the first location within the menu (col.5, In. 44-59,. col.7, In. 36-67 and col. 8, In.25-46).

- 6. Regarding claim 3, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising storing the navigation path as a sequence of navigation steps leading to the first location (*sub-context object level*) (*col.7*, 1n.36-67).
- 7. Regarding claim 4, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising storing the navigation

Art Unit: 2655

path as a semantic sequence of navigation steps leading to the first location (*context* data file) (*col.4*, *In.44-57*, *col.7*, *In.* 36-67 and *col.* 8, *In.* 25-46).

- 8. Regarding claim 5, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, wherein the menu structure includes associated text and the method further comprising storing the navigation path as a semantic sequence of text associated with the navigation steps leading to the first location (ink field) (*col.* 9, *In.* 49-61);
- 9. Regarding claim 6, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising constructing a speech model associated with the first utterance (vocabulary set) and associating the speech model with the navigation path (*context data file*) (*col.6, In.6-18 and 43-67 and col.8, In.* 25-35).
- 10. Regarding claim 7, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising using a speech recognizer (*voice recognition*) to compare the first and second utterances in performing a matching step (*col.3, In.31-36; col-4, In.35-43 and col. 6, In.43-49*).
- 11. Regarding claim 8, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising constructing a speech

Art Unit: 2655

model associated with the first utterance and using the speech model to populate a lexicon of speech (appropriate set of spoken commands/tcol.6, In.6-49); and using a speech recognizer to compare the first and second utterances in performing a matching step (col.4, 1n.35-49 and col.8, In.25-46).

- 12. Regarding claim 9, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, wherein the step of identifying the user-selected navigation path comprises displaying the first location on a visible display associated with the electronic product and prompting the user to provide the first utterance (*Fig.1A* and col.5, *In.2-15*).
- 13. Regarding claim 11, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising a providing user feedback of the association between the first utterance and the navigation path by the first location on a visible display associated with the electronic product and producing a textual representation of the first utterance (Fig.1A, elements Child 1, OK and CANCEL; col.5, In.2-15 and col.9, In. 49-61).
- 14. Regarding claim 13, De Armas et al. further disclose the textual representation (decoded phrase) is provided using a speech recognizer (col.9, In.19-61).

Art Unit: 2655

15. Regarding claim 14, De Armas et al. further disclose the textual representation (decoded phrase) is provided by storing a text data associated with the first utterance and displaying the text data (*window text string*) at user request (*Fig. 2, col. 6, In.19-28; col. 8, 1n.25-29 and col.9, In.19-61*).

- 16. Regarding claim 15, De Armas et al. further disclose a voice binding system to aid in user operation of electronic devices, comprising: a menu navigator that provides a traversable menu structure offering a plurality of predefined menu locations (*Fig.1A*, *col. 4*, *In.* 25-43 and col. 5, *In.* 36-39); a speech recognizer having an associated lexicon data store (*vocabulary set*) (*col. 8*, *1n.*25-33 and col. 9, *In.*14-47); a processor for adding user-defined speech to the lexicon (*the action of edit box*) (col. 7, In. 23-27), and a voice binding system couple to the menu navigator for associating the user-defined speech with predetermined menu locations within the menu structure, operable to traverse to a predetermined menu location in response to a spoken utterance corresponding to the user-defined speech (*col.*7, *In.*1-35).
- 17. Regarding claim 16, De Armas et al. further disclose the menu navigator includes at least one navigation button operable to traverse the menu structure (*Fig.1A*, *element* 34).

Art Unit: 2655

- 18. Regarding claim 17, De Armas et al. further discloses the voice binding system stores predefined menu locations as traversal path sequences (*col. 8, In.25-32 and col. 10, In.21-32*).
- 19. Regarding claim 18, De Armas et al. further discloses the voice binding system stores predefined menu locations as semantic sequences (*col.9, In.30-61*).
- 20. Claims 10, 12, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over De Armas et al. (US 5873064) in view of Davis (US 6816837), as applied to claims 2 and 15, respectively, and further in view of Croft (US 6493670).
- 21. Regarding claims 10 and 12, De Armas et al. further disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, further comprising a providing user feedback of the association between the first utterance and the navigation path by the first location on a visible display associated with the electronic product (*Fig.1A* and col. 5, In. 2-15). De Armas et al. does not specifically disclose the method of navigating the menu structure with the electronic product, wherein it produced an audible representation of the first utterance, wherein the audible representation is provided by storing the first utterance as an audio data and replaying the audio data at user request.

Croft teaches when the user speaks into the electronic product will produce the audible output comparable to the sentence that was spoken by storing the first utterance as the audio data and replaying the audio data (*speech waveform memory*)

Art Unit: 2655

(Fig. 5, step 510 and col. 5, 14-28). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of navigating the menu structure of the electronic product of De Armas et al. with the capability of producing the audible feedback output, as taught by Croft, in order to confirm to the user at user request the correctness of the speech recognition as taught by Croft (col.5, In.16-18 and 27).

22. Regarding claims 19 and 20, De Armas et al. further disclose the voice binding system comprising a user feedback system operable to textual reproduce the user-defined speech associated with predefined menu locations (col. 9, In. 49-61). De Armas et al. does not specifically disclose the voice binding system comprising a user feedback system operable to audibly reproduce the user-defined speech (stored as recorded speech waveforms) associated with predefined menu locations. Craft teaches when the speech recognition receives the user's spoken input, the system will produce the audible output if the spoken utterance from the user does match the defined vocabulary of the speech recognition, and playback recorded speech waveforms (col. 5, In. 20-24). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the voice binding system of De Armas et al. with the user feedback system, as taught by Croft, in order to confirm to the user the correctness of the speech recognition as taught by Croft (col. 5, In.16-18 and 27).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ortega (US 6263375) teaches a method for creating dictation macros that is considered pertinent to the claim invention.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Huyen X. Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 9-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wayne Young can be reached on 571-272-7582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2655

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HXV 9/1/2005

W/R. YOUNG PRIMARY EXAMINE Page 11